

Remarks:

These remarks are responsive to the Office action dated May 16, 2005. Prior to the entry of this amendment, claims 1-26 remained pending in the application. Claims 1-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on Lortz (US 6,505,243). With the entry of this amendment, claims 2, 18, 20, and 26 are cancelled without prejudice. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections for at least the reasons set forth below.

Rejection of Claims 1-17

In the present Office action, claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Lortz (US 6,505,243). With this amendment, claim 1 has been amended to include features previously recited in claim 2, and claim 2 has been cancelled without prejudice. As presently amended, claim 1 recites, in part, a device management system including "a server configured to execute a management application... a device... and... at least one agent/codelet pair including an agent and a codelet, wherein the device is configured to execute the codelet and the management application is configured to execute the agent, and the agent and codelet are configured to communicate with each other via the network to achieve a predetermined function." The Examiner asserts that Lortz discloses the device management system recited by claim 1.

Lortz relates to automatic web-based detection and display of product installation help information. The Examiner asserts that Lortz teaches both the device and the management application recited in claim 1. Lortz, however, fails to teach, disclose, or suggest an agent/codelet pair, with the agent executable by the management application and the codelet executable by the device, as also recited in amended claim 1.

Lortz discloses a network interface that enables a configuration device to communicate configuration information to a minimally configured device that is newly installed on the network. In the rejection to claim 1, the Examiner suggests that Lortz' configuration device is analogous to the server of claim 1 of the present application, and that Lortz' minimally configured device is analogous to the device of claim 1 of the present application. The configuration information disclosed by Lortz resides either on the configuration device, or on the minimally configured device, whereas the agent/codelet pair taught by the applicants reside pair-wise on the server (generally corresponding to Lortz' configuration device) and the device (generally corresponding to Lortz' minimally configured device) respectively. There is no discussion in the Lortz reference of configuration information residing pair-wise on both the configuration device and minimally configured device. Accordingly, Lortz fails to teach, disclose, or suggest every limitation of claim 1 of the present application.

Since Lortz fails to disclose every element of claim 1, applicants submit that claim 1 is allowable and requests the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Lortz. Furthermore, since claims 3-17 depend from claim 1, applicants assert that these claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1. Claims 3-6, 8, and 10-11 have been amended so that claim limitations will have proper antecedent basis in amended claim 1.

Rejection of Claim 18

Claim 18 has been cancelled without prejudice, thus rendering the Examiner's rejection of claim 18 moot.

Rejection of Claim 19

In the present Office action, claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Lortz (US 6,505,243). Claim 19 recites, in part, a device management system including "at least one agent/codelet pair including an agent and a codelet, wherein the embedded server is configured to automatically upload the agent to the management application of the management server." The Examiner asserts that Lortz discloses the device management system recited by claim 19.

As discussed above in reference to claim 1, Lortz fails to teach, disclose, or suggest the agent/codelet pair recited in claim 19. Lortz thus fails to disclose every element of claim 19, and the rejection of claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Lortz should be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 20-24

In the present Office action, claims 20-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Lortz (US 6,505,243). Claim 20 has been cancelled without prejudice. Claim 21, which previously depended from claim 20, has been amended herein to recite the features previous included in claim 20 but in independent form. Claim 21, as amended, specifically recites, in part, a method of managing one or more devices connected to a computer network including "preconfiguring a device with an agent/codelet pair." The Examiner asserts that Lortz discloses the method recited by claim 21.

As discussed above in reference to claim 1, Lortz fails to teach, disclose, or suggest the agent/codelet pair recited in claim 21. Lortz thus fails to disclose every element of claim 21, and the rejection of claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Lortz should be withdrawn. In addition, claims 22-24 depend from claim 21, and are allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 21.

Rejection of Claim 25

In the present Office action, claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Lortz (US 6,505,243). Claim 25 recites, in part, a method of managing one or more devices connected to a computer network including "at least one agent/codelet pair having an agent and a codelet." The Examiner asserts that Lortz discloses the device management system recited by claim 25.

As discussed above in reference to claim 1, Lortz fails to teach, disclose, or suggest the agent/codelet pair recited in claim 25. Lortz thus fails to disclose every element of claim 25, and the rejection of claim 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Lortz should be withdrawn. Claim 25 has been amended herein to correct a typographical error in the preamble.

Rejection of Claim 26

Claim 26 has been cancelled without prejudice, thus rendering the Examiner's rejection of claim 26 moot.

Applicants believe that this application is in condition for allowance in view of the above remarks. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner issue a Notice of Allowability covering the pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions, or if a telephone interview would in any way advance prosecution of the application, please contact the undersigned attorney of record.

Respectfully submitted,


KOLISCH HARTWELL, P.C.



Walter W. Karnstein
Registration No. 35,565
520 S.W. Yamhill Street, Suite 200
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: (503) 224-6655
Facsimile: (503) 295-6679
Attorney for Applicants

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to Examiner M. Delgado, Group Art Unit 2144, Commissioner for Patents, at facsimile number (703) 872-9306 on August 16, 2005.



Christie A. Doolittle

Page 12 - AMENDMENT
Serial No. 09/875,331
HP Docket No. 10007050-1
KH Docket No. HPCB 315